Equal Rights

VOL. XX, No. 8
FIVE CENTS

SATURDAY
MARCH 24, 1934

MAR 23 1934

Demand Constitutional Rights

At a mass-meeting held recently in Vienna, Austrian women voiced a strong protest against the new law which violates the guarantee in the Austrian Constitution that men and women shall have "the same rights as citizens before the law." The meeting was held under the auspices of the Austrian Woman's Party. In the front row, third from the right, is Helene Granitsch, president of the Austrian Woman's Party.

Equal Rights

OFFICIAL ORGAN
of the
National Woman's Party
Capitol Hill,
Washington, D. C.
Phone, Atlantic 1210
Published Weekly
at 19 West Chase Street,
Baltimore, Md.
Phone, Vernon 3279

Edith Houghton Hooker . . . . . Editor
Emilie A. Doetsch . . . . Managing Editor
Dora G. Ogle . . . . Business Manager

ASSOCIATE EDITORS:

Nina E. Allender
Zoe Beckley
Ruby A. Black
Lucia Chamberlain
Phyllis Duganne
Ernestine Evans
Rose Feld
Zona Gale
Helen Davenport Gibbons
Rebecca Hourwich
Ruth Hale
Inez Haynes Irwin
Ada Davenport Kendall
Muna Lee
Alma Lutz
Hazel MacKaye
Edna St. Vincent Millay
Ruth Pickering
Alice Rohe
Maryse Rutledge
Miriam Finn Scott
Doris Stevens
Sophie Treadwell
Brenda Ueland
Mary Winsor

Entered as second-class matter at Postoffice, Baltimore, Md., under Act March 3, 1879.

Subscription, $2.00 a Year
Foreign Subscription, $2.50

OFFICERS OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Chairman National Council, Sarah T. Colvin, 1175 Davern Avenue, St. Paul, Minnesota.
Vice-Chairmen,
Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Gail Laughlin, Me.
Anita Pollitzer, S. C.
Secretary, Rebekah Greathouse, D. C.
Treasurer, Laura Berrien, D. C.
Congressional Chairman, Maud Younger, Cal.
Parliamentarian, Emma A. Fox, Mich.

Edwina Austin Avery, D. C.
Nina E. Allender, D. C.
Mrs. Dwight Clark, D. C.
Mrs. Merritt O. Chance, D. C.
Bertha W. Fowler, Colo.
Elsie Hill, Conn.
Inez Haynes Irwin, N. Y.
Edith Houghton Hooker, Md.
Elizabeth T. Kent, Calif.
Alma Lutz, N. Dak.
Burnita S. Matthews, Miss.
Lola Maverick Lloyd, Ill.
Mary A. Murray, N. Y.
Dora G. Ogle, Md.
Alice Paul, N. J.
Elizabeth Selden Rogers, N.Y.
Jane Norman Smith, N. Y.
A. Marguerite Smith, Mass.
Doris Stevens, N. Y.
Mrs. John Jay White, N. Y.
Margaret Whittemore, Calif.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.
Mrs. Valentine Winters, Ohio
Maud Younger, Calif.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

Annual Dues	$10.00
Associate Members	$1.00
Subscribing Members	$3.00
Founders	$100.00
Life Members	$1,000.00
Endowers	$5,000.00
Sustainers	$5,000.00

OBJECT OF THE WOMAN'S PARTY

The object of this organization shall be to secure for women complete equality with men under the law and in all human relationships.

THE LUCRETIA MOTT AMENDMENT

"Men and women shall have Equal Rights throughout the United States and every place subject to its jurisdiction."

"Congress shall have power to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

[Senate Joint Resolution Number 1]
[House Joint Resolution Number 1]

Introduced in the Senate March 10, 1933, by SENATOR JOHN G. TOWNSEND, Delaware.

Introduced in the House March 9, 1933, by REPRESENTATIVE LOUIS LUDLOW, Indiana.

Remove the Stigma

OUR sympathies go out in fullest measure to the women of Austria. After the downfall of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, a constitution was adopted in the first paragraph of which Equal Rights without regard to sex, race or class was guaranteed. Now we hear that Austrian Feminists recently held a mass-meeting to protest against the passage of a law which completely nullifies the concept of Equal Rights in that it ousts women civil servants whose husbands are also in government employ, provided the joint salaries total a certain arbitrary amount.

This is tragedy indeed. The constitutions of Germany and Austria had given us reason to hope. The German Republic had opened all its doors to women, and German women were forging to the front in all lines, notably in politics and government, the Reichstag having proportionately a considerably larger number of women members than, for instance, Parliament or Congress. Then came Hitler and the ukase of the Nazi government ordering women back to the home. Now Austria demands that its married women government workers of a certain class give up their jobs to young men.

In both cases, the avowed purpose is to provide more work for men, so that young men may marry and become founders of families. It is perhaps needless to point out to readers of EQUAL RIGHTS, or in fact to Feminists anywhere, that implicit in this attitude is a supreme insult to all women, whether married or unmarried. In the last analysis, this virtually means that women as individuals, per se, have little or no value to the State, human welfare, civilization—call it what you will—except in the matter of bringing children into the world. The fact that skilled and experienced women public servants are to be thrown out of positions to make way for young and inexperienced men, is not only absurd, and harmful to the government that puts such a policy into effect; the denial to a woman of the recognition of her individual worth, her right as a free agent to work out her own destiny, degrates every member of the human family who bears the name of woman.

Women might well consider, if the bearing of children is the cause of their depreciation, whether they should not deny themselves the great privilege of motherhood until the stigma that attaches to them as bearers of the race is removed from every statute book.

Strength in Unity

EVERY now and then some event transpires that makes us exult in the solidarity of women.

In Geneva, the Hague, Montevideo, recently in Baltimore—where a Princess from far-off Syria spoke from the same platform as Doris Stevens who had just returned from Montevideo—the world was made conscious that women everywhere are banded together in a spiritual union whose object is the establishment of a new concept of justice.

But, in addition to this moral support which we share with and receive from women in distant lands, there is another very practical way in which Feminists can help each other as individuals, each in her own community. It is pointed out by Ruth Gill Williams in her paper on "The Economic Pinch" which appears in this issue. Miss Williams suggests that women deliberately and consistently, not spasmodically or sporadically, join in a compact to help each other by buying whatever they may need, whether in the way of services or material things, from women.

There was a time when this might not have been possible. The woman doctor and lawyer, as well as the woman merchant, florist, caterer and manufacturer, were few and far between. But the last few years have truly brought about a revolution in this regard and the list of business and professional women, in large cities at least, is large and impressive. Not only that, but self-supporting women today are organized in commercial and professional clubs, membership in which in most cases depends upon excellence of professional and business standing, so that leaders among such women are easily discovered.

If women are to be thrust out of work to make room for men, it is up to the women to see that their sisters so discriminated against have the loyal support of the women of their own communities. In order to win, we must fight prejudice with weapons that are equally as efficient as those that are used against us.

The Married Workers' Ouster

(Contributed by the Government Workers' Council, National Woman's Party.)

AMONG the many measures passed during the last two sessions of Congress with the object of improving economic conditions is the so-called Economy Act of 1933. Section 213 of this Act (the "married persons" clause) inserted by the House of Representatives under conditions of hysteria and panic, singles out the most honorable and necessary of all social relationships as a basis for separation from the Government service of a large number of well-qualified and efficient civil service employees. The Act provides that wherever reductions in personnel are necessary, married persons whose spouses are employed by the Government shall be dismissed first. Since its passage in June, 1932, hundreds of married workers have been discharged or forced to resign.

No matter how ill-advised the action may have been, and no matter how unjust and discriminatory have been the workings out of the law, it may be assumed that those who wrote Section 213 into the Economy Act did so in the sincere belief that it would help to spread employment, raise purchasing power, decrease taxation, and reduce bread lines. Close observation of the operation of the law during the past year and a half has disclosed not only that it has not accomplished the ends desired, but that in fact it has increased unemployment, has been the means of decreasing purchasing power and increasing taxation, and has materially added to the bread lines. These are startling statements to make, but an examination of the facts here set forth will show them to be all too correct.

ALTHOUGH one of the main arguments advanced by the advocates of this law is that two persons in the same family should not draw salaries from the Government, this law reaches only those salaries drawn by husband and wife. It is doubtful whether there is a single case where a husband and wife in the Government service are using both their salary checks for their own household. The wife's salary has been used, in most cases, to either wholly or partially support aged parents. During these last hard years, however, this salary has had to cover not only the needs of their parents, but also those of brothers, sisters, and other relatives. It has had to assist in paying taxes and staving off foreclosure on the family properties "back home," and in other ways be a financial stop gap for the families of both husband and wife so that public charity would not be necessary.

Another argument put forth in favor of the law is that the married woman works to provide herself with luxuries. However, in a recent investigation made by the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor, the reasons for holding jobs given by nine out of every ten married women interviewed on the subject were: to keep the home and family together because of the husband's inadequate wage, to raise the family's standard of living to the health-and-decency basis, to give the children better education, to buy a home or household equipment, to pay doctor's or hospital bills, to support elderly parents or other relatives, to save for a rainy day or to provide for old age.

A survey of Government personnel made by the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics in 1928 of 506 married men earning $2,500 a year or less, with dependents, showed that less than 10 per cent. were able to support their families without other sources of income.

THROUGH a survey made by the National Federation of Government Employees in the summer of 1932, it was found that in one field service in which 446 married couples were employed the average salary of the men was only $1,640 a year and that of the women only $1,260. A number of the men received $720 a year, or less, and a number of the women $600 or less, and only eight men and one woman received salaries in excess of $2,500.

With all this background of economic need, this unfair and discriminatory law takes no account of the size of the two salaries involved. An unmarried person may draw a salary of $10,000 or more from the Government, without regard to needs or responsibilities, but the joint salary of husband and wife, although it may be as low as $2,000, or less, is subject to a possible reduction of 50 per cent. Women have been dismissed whose husbands are enlisted men, who can not resign, and who receive as low as $55 per month. There are also cases where the wife has been discharged while the husband was on a furlough status with his income reduced to one-third its original size.

Although the term "married persons" is used in the wording of the law, there is no doubt that it really was directed only toward married women. This has been recognized not only by the members of Congress and the executive departments of the Government, but the press, the pulpit, and the public. As was expected and intended, it is usually the wife who resigns to save her husband's job when a choice is allowed. This law is operating to take out of the Government departments, both in Washington and in the field, and out of the schools of the District of Columbia, valuable workers with long experience and a high degree of efficiency.

This law penalizes marriage to the exclusion of any other family relationship. Throughout the Government service we find members of the same family—father and son, mother and daughter, sisters, brothers, and so on—unaffected by Section 213 although in many cases living under the same economic conditions as husband and wife. Furthermore, married persons whose spouses draw salaries or income from any other sources than the Federal Government or who hold political positions, such as the Vice-Presidency of the United States or the Speakership of the House of Representatives, are not affected. Only when both husband and wife are in the classified Civil Service or enlisted in the regular forces of the United States Army or Navy is it considered that one salary is sufficient for their combined needs.

We hear great alarm expressed about women taking the jobs of men, but little is heard about the volume of work formerly done by women that has been taken over by the men who operate the laundries and bakeries, and the factories which dry, can, and preserve our foods: spin, weave, and fashion our clothing; and make our butter, cheese, soap, and vacuum cleaners. If, under this law and similar ones passed by states and municipalities which followed the example set by the Federal Government, married women are forced out of paid employment which has allowed them to purchase more household equipment, clothing, etc., what is going to happen to the men whose jobs depend upon the continued operation of the industries producing these articles?

MOREOVER, with the family purchasing power cut in half by the wife's dismissal, the ranks of the unemployed are further augmented by the domestic servants necessarily discharged by the marmied women who lose their jobs, and the bread lines are augmented by dependents formerly supported on the wife's salary.

This law fails to spread employment, because under its provisions vacancies created by the dismissal of these married workers cannot be filled.

Instead of decreasing taxation it will increase taxation, because under this law the basis of dismissal, instead of being the efficiency of the employee, becomes his or her marital status. In other words, heretofore when dismissals have been necessary in the Government service because of the cessation of work or decreased appropriations, those dismissals have always been made on the basis of efficiency. Now a married worker with an efficiency rating of 90 or better will be dismissed while another worker not coming within

the provisions of this law and with a rating of only 65 will be retained. This can not help but result not only in more costly service but also in a less efficient service. If the Government service exists for the purpose of providing salaries for people who need them, then all its employees who have sufficient income from other sources should be discharged and all salaries should be adjusted on the basis of actual need; but if the service exists for the transaction of Government business, then appointments and dismissals should be made on the basis of efficiency and that alone.

THE present administration has gone a long way in placing splendid women—many of them married—in positions of honor and trust, an indication that it does not consider marriage a handicap to efficiency nor that it should, of itself, prevent active participation in business or public affairs. Some of our leaders in Congress have as their able assistants their wives, who, as well as other wives in the legislative branch of the Government, are free to pursue their chosen work, while under Section 213 less fortunate wives in the Executive branch of the Government, adding their small salaries to those of their husbands for the support of the family, are penalized by being required to give up their positions and sacrifice needed incomes.

In times of national emergencies great stress is laid on the dependence that is being placed upon the married women of the country to support the measures devised by the Government for bringing the country safely through such emergencies. Married women were welcomed in business and Government positions during the war, and they are now being told that the success of the National Industrial Recovery program depends largely upon their cooperation. At the same time it is demanded of many of them that they be still more patriotic and give up their jobs to others, perhaps less needy than themselves.

Marriage does not remove a woman's responsibilities under the law, as a citizen, a voter, and a taxpayer. In some States she is charged with equal responsibility with her husband for financial obligations, support of children and support of parents. Why, then, should this particular class of citizens be singled out to be made the subject of a law which prevents them from living their lives in the way in which they think will best serve their own and their country's interests?

Our administration leaders have repeatedly committed themselves to the upholding of the Civil Service system of appointment and retention in Government service on the basis of proven ability, yet every dismissal made on any other basis than that of efficiency is a direct attack on that system. Married workers, as well as single workers, have qualified for appointment by passing competitive examinations and have built up their efficiency by years of experience in their various lines of work and in many cases by taking additional training. Those who have been dismissed have not only lost their incomes but their Civil Service status and their retirement privilege as well. Since the same law which dictates their dismissal also operates to prevent their reinstatement as long as there are unmarried persons on the Civil Service register, dismissal means for them either dependence upon some one else for maintenance or, after a weary and heartless search, perhaps some menial employment outside the Government, or the bread line, since the dismissal of one spouse does not mean that the other is guaranteed continued employment. They are not always qualified for outside work, and especially does age limitation restrict many of them. Married women, in particular, have been refused re-employment repeatedly in the new emergency agencies of the Government, which are not subject to the Civil Service law.

It is unfair to undertake to correct an economic depression by forcing any one class of our citizens to make a total sacrifice. The only just means of solving the problem is for every one to share alike in the work and the sacrifice.

The heads of Government offices have been urged to substitute furloughs for dismissals where reductions in force were necessary. Even where the desire was only to penalize the married class, these persons could have been furloughed indefinitely rather than dismissed, and in this way they would have retained their Civil Service standing, which would have allowed their re-employment in their own organizations, should increased personnel be necessary in the future, or they would have had the privilege of transferring to other services of the Government needing trained personnel. Such requests have usually been denied. The Independent Offices Act of 1934 authorized the President to establish uniform rules for furlough of personnel throughout the Government service, but no such regulations have been issued, and each department or office of the Government is acting on its own initiative in such matters.

AND while this goes on, pressure is being applied by the same Government to the industrial groups to induce them to employ more people at higher salaries!

Again, the motive given for the passage of Section 213 was said to be economy, yet it is well known that Government expenditures since the passage of this law have far exceeded those of any of the years immediately preceding. Some of the same branches of the service which dismissed married employees under the plea of funds are now adding new workers to their personnel, drawing them in parts from the Civil Service registers but principally from outside sources.

As yet the constitutionality of this law has not been passed upon by the United States Supreme Court, but it is felt certain that a constitutional question is involved, since the law is clearly discriminatory and against public policy.

The question may also be raised as to the effect this law and other similar ones will have on marriage in the future. It is not difficult to answer. Ultimately, if such laws are not repealed, marriages will decrease and divorces and immorality will increase, thus weakening not only our family life but our whole social structure. We already have reports of a decrease in the number of marriages during the past year, due to the economic conditions, and there are records of many cases of marriage plans being abandoned and separations sought due to the passage of Section 213. A very large proportion of married couples now in the Government service would not or could not have married if by so doing one or the other had forfeited his income, and in a number of cases, due to the operation of this law, it has become imperative for married Government employees to obtain divorces because of responsibility for the support of parents or other relatives.

THIS legislation is an attack on all women, as will later become apparent to those in the departments who so strongly urged its passage, in the selfish hope that its application might advance their personal positions. We dare not shut our eyes to what is happening in Europe. In the United States also, the mania to take jobs away from married women and give them to men, if not checked, can easily grow to include all women. Such laws have a vital bearing on the whole social status of woman — her education, her career. If she is to be deprived of the privilege which all men enjoy of equal continuity in employment and in promotion, the incentive for preparation is gone and instead of taking her proper place in the work for the advancement of civilization, she finds herself deprived of the privilege of choice as to how she shall shape her life. The women of this country (and all countries) have too much at stake to permit personal antagonism to interfere with that unity of effort which alone will make possible the removal of all the injustices that have been imposed upon the sex by both Federal and State laws.

Every woman of voting age has urgent reason for being interested in this problem and taking an active part in solving it. Alice Paul, internationally known leader in work for the equality of the sexes, says, "Women have failed to coordinate their power as they should, not only for their own protection but in order that the principles for which women stand may be embodied in our civilization."

Puerto Rico Welcomes Minerva Bernardino

By Muna Lee

ANNOUNCED by a cable from Doris Stevens, Chairman of the Inter American Commission of Women, Minerva Bernardino, representative of the Dominican Republic on the Commission, arrived in San Juan, Puerto Rico, on Monday morning, February 12, on her way home from the great Feminist triumph in the Seventh Pan-American Conference.

A delegation of Puerto Rican Feminists, including Isabel Andreu de Aguilar, vice-president of the Board of Trustees of the University of Puerto Rico, Angelo Negrón Muñoz, lecturer and writer, and Muna Lee de Muñoz Marin, member of the Nationality Committee of the Inter American Commission of Women, accompanied by the Dominican Consul in Puerto Rico, Señor Llaverias, were at the wharf at six o'clock in the morning to meet the incoming *Borinquen* with Señorita Bernardino aboard. Her stay was to be all too brief, a question of hours merely, since she had to continue her voyage on the same boat that afternoon, to Santo Domingo, the sister island on the other side of Mona Passage. Everybody wanted to see the Dominican Commissioner, to congratulate her, to talk with her and hear first-hand the thrilling story of Montevideo.

Accompanied by Señorita Dinora Peynado, charming daughter of the candidate for Vice-President of the Dominican Republic, and by Muna Lee and the Dominican Consul, Señorita Bernardino visited the Capitol and exchanged greetings with Señorita Maria Luisa Arcelay, first woman member of the Puerto Rican Legislature, and only Latin-American woman legislator. The Dominican Commissioner was then interviewed and photographed by the San Juan papers. Antonio Coll Vidal, feature writer for *El Mundo,* who as a member of the Secretariat of the Sixth Pan-American Conference cooperated cordially in the Feminist campaign at Havana, was one of the first to congratulate Señorita Bernardino; and she was also most cordially welcomed by Senator Luis Muñoz Marin, editor of *La Democracia,* who headed the secretariat at the Sixth Conference and has through the press and in the Puerto Rican Senate been a consistent advocate of Equal Rights.

The University of Puerto Rico, which has always evidenced a cordial spirit of cooperation with the Inter American Commission of Women, gave a luncheon in honor of Señorita Bernardino at the Carlota Matienzo Residence for Women Students. Chancellor Carlos E. Chardon of the University presided, and among those present, in addition to the honor guest and Señorita Peynado, and the delegation which had welcomed her at the dock, were representative Feminists representing different groups. These included the Commissioner of Public Instruction, Dr. José Padin and his wife; Señorita Arcelay, Member of the House of Representatives; Dean Maria E. Machin, who took part in the nationality campaign at Geneva in 1932; Señora Librada de Soto, President of the Liga de Mujeres Votantes; Señora Rita Lang, Director of the Women's Section of the insular NRA; Mrs. Maude Walters, President of the Puerto Rican Branch of the American Association of University Women; Señorita Herminia Acevado and Señora Maria Cadilla de Martinez, Feminists, writers, and educators; Elizabeth Kneipple Van Deusen, well-known writer; Señora Blanca Malaret de Saliva, Director of the *Residencia;* and Doña Ana Vélez, one of the original Puerto Rican suffragists, who has devoted many years to the cause of woman's advancement.

Chancellor Chardon welcomed Señorita Bernardino in the name of the University and expressed the interest of this institution and the island in the success of the Campaign at Montevideo. Señorita Bernardino responded with a brief but eloquent tribute to the cooperation and loyalty of women in all Latin-American countries to the cause of Feminism. The Dominican Consul recalled the long tradition of friendship and intellectual interchange between Puerto Rico and Santo Domingo; and the Commissioner of Public Instruction expressed the hope that such interchange should continue, and paid tribute to the increasingly important part taken by women in promoting international friendship and understanding.

After luncheon, the guests passed though the beautiful interior patio of the Residencia, whose paving of old Spanish tiles is centered by a Moorish fountain and shaded by palms and flowers; and heard Señorita Bernardino describe vividly the dramatic events at the Conference in Montevideo, when Doris Stevens brilliantly and successfully challenged the authority of the United States delegation to interpret the will of the women of the United States. None could listen unmoved as the story of the great triumph was related there among the ferns and flowers, under the bright tropical sky of February; a story which brought Montevideo and Washington, New York and Santo Domingo, into immediate, direct relation with San Juan, so long isolated on its Caribbean rock. The rapid questions of her hearers, the illuminating answers of the Dominican Commissioner, the intensity of the interest aroused, showed the full realization of all present that they had been brought into contact with one of the great events of our time.

The Economic Pinch

By Ruth Gill Williams

CERTAINLY one of the important aims of the Equal Rights movement is to secure for women economic independence.

Enforced financial dependence places an individual or a group in the uncertain and ignominious position of having to take without recourse what is handed out instead of being able to demand what is one's rightful due.

Naturally any step which increases the opportunity for women seeking employment, automatically advances the cause of Equal Rights. Most of the legislation against which the National Woman's Party so valiantly fights is legislation which discriminates against the right of women to earn their living in just such a free manner as men may earn theirs.

Of course, not all jobs are controlled by legislation. Far more are controlled by individuals. And in this classification women are all too frequently cut off from opportunity by the prejudices and jealousies of men who are in a position to dictate employment policies. In a way this type of discrimination is more deadly because it is not out in the open and is therefore more difficult to combat. Even the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment will leave us with this battle still to fight.

The theory of giving employment where most needed has furnished a high-sounding but hypocritical excuse for discrimination against women. This is the type of job-control which is responsible for the terrible injustices dealt out to women during this depression. The wholly vicious idea has become rampant that if an employed woman has any relative who is not in a breadline she should be forced out and her job given to some man. Any man—because no one stops to analyze the needs of any *man.* No one suggests that men with millions, even billions, retire from business. No one suggests that men with independent incomes or men whose wives have independent incomes should be denied employment. No one suggests that single men retire in favor of married men or widows with dependents. No employer discharges a man with one child because a man with two children could use his job to better advantage. Where men are concerned, a desire to engage in gainful occupation is considered a sign of ambition. Yet when the same char-

acteristic takes women into industry, business or the professions, it is called avarice. How often have we heard it said of a wealthy man, "In spite of all his money, he is a hard worker and ambitious"?

A woman has just as much right as a man to be ambitious and to wish to engage in gainful occupation regardless of necessity and only minds warped by jealousy or fear of competition endeavor to deny that right.

BUT there is no use shutting our eyes to conditions as they exist. There is undeniably a movement gaining daily to put women out of any but the most menial jobs—the ones men do not want. A drive to place women *totally* at the mercy of men. Even in organizations where the selling is done on a straight commission basis there is a disposition to shut women out from the opportunity.

It took me a long time to become convinced that it is foolhardy for women to expect voluntary fair treatment from most men. I have doubted my own ears at times when men I have known have looked straight at me and made remarks concerning the ability and intelligence of women that were unbelievably insulting. Sometimes they have been sitting right at my own dinner table accepting my hospitality.

I have found that men who entertain this hostile attitude toward women are very much in the majority—and that it is difficult to find men who are fair-minded on the subject of women, although there are a few. These few are found among the cream of masculine intelligence. They fear no competition. But the majority of men will not be fair to women and particularly they will not allow economic independence to women if they can in any way stop it.

Several years ago was born in me the realization that I had been taking insults from men and in return helping to give them livelihoods while women in the same businesses were being forced out by lack of patronage.

So I decided that from that time on I would SPEND WITH WOMEN.

Business is based on sales and sales depend on purchases.

For generations women have controlled a large percentage of all purchases. But women have in no way used this great power to bring about recognition of equality between the sexes. For if they had there would be no economic problem for women because the demand for their services would far exceed the supply.

If women do not patronize women, no one will.

Men will tip their hats to women, get on and off an elevator after women and pretend they are being chivalrous by taking the more desirable aisle seats at the theater — BUT — when it comes to purchasing commodities or services, they will go out of their way to patronize men.

Women must secure women *in* business by securing business *to* women. I believe that we must awake to this possibility of applying economic pressure through purchases. In my case I have put it into practice. I buy from women.

I soon found there could be no half-way action. That in order to break a long habit it was necessary to give myself a slogan, "Buy from women." I can say from experience that it is necessary to say this to yourself over and over again almost like a creed or you will find yourself making too many exceptions unconsciously. For instance, it is so easy for a woman to overlook the fact that she does not go to a woman doctor, dentist, lawyer, chiropodist, hairdresser. And that she does not always select a woman from whom to buy—whether it be insurance, shoes, soaps or sealing wax.

Of course, it is easy to recognize this powerful weapon and decide to make use of it individually and then the very next morning forget to put it into operation. Frequently the very lack of knowledge as to the way to find these women becomes a hurdle. In that connection my own experience might be of more interest than any additional discussion.

The dentist situation was the first one I encountered. At the time, I didn't actually know of a woman dentist in Philadelphia. But I knew there must be such, so I wrote to the president of the Woman's Hospital asking her to give me the name of a good woman dentist. That letter resulted in my securing the services of a wonder and several persons, both women and men whom I have sent to her, feel the same way about her ability. It is worth mentioning that when I told her how and why I got her name she told me it was the first time any one had come to her by such a route and that it was a source of great encouragement to her.

MY next need was a skin specialist and again I wrote the president of the Woman's Hospital and again she gave me the name of a doctor whose very personality makes you feel that you are in the hands of the best and whose skillful work proves that to be no exaggeration.

Then I needed the services of a medical doctor and I found an excellent one. Her name I got from a friend. My dentist furnished me with the name of a conscientious insurance saleswoman who knows her business thoroughly. This woman assured me that my business had come to her as a life-saver at a crucial time and gave her new inspiration.

You may have guessed that I am well pleased with my finds. I am. Enthusiastically so. I feel that in addition to helping women in their struggle for economic independence and for recognition in fields of accepted importance, I have done myself a great kindness because without exception I have received from women a much higher grade of treatment and service than I ever had from men.

To find the right doctor, dentist and other professional women is really not difficult and once the contacts are established you just go to them as a matter of course when the need arises. But something which requires more constant vigilance is the watching of every purchase. A little practice along this line makes perfect and after a while it gets to be second nature to search out a woman for your every need.

When I go into a store, if a sales*man* comes up to me I spare his feelings by simply saying, "I am just looking." And so I am—just looking for a woman to wait on me. Because I find it very difficult to be as brutally impolite to men as they are to women.

IN addition to buying from women, I think it is very important to make known our preference for them. First of all, to the women themselves. It gives them confidence to know that their services are appreciated and opens their eyes to the fact that they too, in self-defense, should patronize women. And wherever possible we should most certainly let employers know that we prefer to buy from women because of the superior service and satisfaction they render. For if it becomes a fact that women buy from women and if the statistics are correct when they state that women do 80% of all buying, then it is dead certain that the services of women in business will be in great demand. An employer's prejudice against women can be made to disappear if the women he employs can show enough sales. And there is every indication that more and more businesses will be headed by individuals who come up through the sales department.

Pitiless, uncompromising, concerted action in this campaign of SPENDING WITH WOMEN is necessary if we are not to be victimized by the relentless hostility of men. Sales is the one lever *absolutely* controlled by consumers. Women have been returning good for evil far too long. Men don't understand. They think we are easy marks and will stand for anything indefinitely. It's time to get hard-boiled. We have our thumb on the windpipe of business. Actually we wouldn't have to press very hard to get results.

If the world is to enjoy the advantages of the untold genius and ability of women and if women are to enjoy the happiness which comes from economic independence and the satisfaction of accomplishment, thinking members of their own sex must back them up.

Austrian Women Protest

A vigorous protest is being made by Austrian women against the new law adopted by the Austrian Government which deprives a married woman of her position if she is employed by the Government and has a husband who is also in the public service, in cases where the joint salaries of the two total more than 3600 Schillings.

Those responsible for the passage of the law, like proponents of such measures in other countries, lay its passage at the door of necessity. It is pointed out that the ranks of the Austrian unemployed are enormous and that it is necessary to provide places for young fen so tsat they can marry and become the founders of families.

The women object that this law, made by men for men, is cruel and unjust, and is furthermore a blow at the first paragraph of the Austrian Constitution guaranteeing "men and women the same rights as citizens before the law without regard to sex, race or class." It is also pointed out that the law is unjust because women in the public service whose husbands may be successful professional or business men are not affected by the rule, while their unhappy sisters, married perhaps to postal employees or teachers, must resign, involving whole families in economic difficulties.

At the request of the Union of Women Teachers and Civil Servants, the Austrian Woman's Party recently held an impressive protest meeting, and a memorial directed to be Austrian Minister of Culture and Instruction and embodying the opposition of the womenhood of Austria to the new law, was presented by Helene Granitsch, President of the Austrian Woman's Party.

The Woman Who Dared Disgrace to Vote

Mildred Seydell in the Atlanta Georgian. Mrs. Seydell is Georgia State Chairman of the Woman's Party.

EACH year we should celebrate February 15 with a special thanksgiving for the goodness of God to have given the world—on this day in 1820—a Susan B. Anthony.

Her very name brings to mind courage, the spirit of the pioneer, and the righted injustices of women.

'Way back in 1860 one of her fights for women resulted in a law which gave married women in New York State the right to their own earnings and guardianship of their own children.

Doesn't it seem strange that there was a time not so long ago when a husband could take his wife's earnings to do with as he pleased without her consent, and that a mother had not Equal Rights with the father anent the guardianship of her children?

But women once were property—slaves. And then a reformer was born in South Adams, Massachusetts. A little baby girl, a daughter of a Quaker. A little baby girl like any other little baby girl, rosy and pretty.

In her baby days one could not tell that the future would be changed for women because of that tiny bundle of flesh.

Who can say when gazing into a baby's eyes what is the child's destiny? Life is full of adventure. Full of surprises and uncertainties.

For Susan B. Anthony it was a glorious struggle. She did not count the cost to herself when she set her goal, Equal Rights for men and women—her eyes were too full of a noble vision. She saw the years ahead where women would take their part, sharing equally privileges and responsibilities and duties with their men.

For fifteen years Miss Anthony taught school. I have always believed that the good teacher learned with her pupils. Whatever lessons this particular teacher learned were lessons that brought forth rich fruit, the fruit of freedom for women, justice in the world.

They said of her that she was an excellent speaker. Most speakers are excellent when they are fired by a passion for right! Excellent speakers are those who forget self, who have a message worth listening to, who, with force and conviction, speak distinctly, with feeling.

Such a speaker was Susan B. Anthony. She lectured extensively in England and in the United States. Everywhere they spoke of her eloquence.

Not only was her voice raised in behalf of women, but also her pen was active in shattering the shackles that made women slaves—slaves to conventions and old notions that women were inferior. She contributed flaming articles to leading magazines.

Articles so full of facts and truths that they could not be refuted. Articles so clearly written that all could understand. Susan B. Anthony was a woman of destiny; a leader born to the people; a pioneer, fearless and inspired.

For many years she was president of the American Suffrage Association. In the elections of 1872 she presented herself at the polls and voted. Imagine, if you can, the furore that caused! A woman had voted!

The hue and cry that went up was terrific. The authorities arrested Miss Anthony, threw her in jail. She was a criminal. She had dared to vote. Had dared to enter the sacred precincts of men.

Had dared to take an interest in her government, the government under which she lived and had been born and reared.

Such action was an unforgivable sin in those benighted days of 1872. A lesser soul might have been discouraged, might have been stunned into submission, and women today might still be mere property of men.

But when one has seen a vision—as undoubtedly Miss Anthony had seen—ignominies are only spurs to egg onward. In prison Susan B. Anthony planned new campaigns, she dreamed new dreams, and when she walked out again into freedom her heart had new vigor for the greater freedom of all women.

What did it matter—her personal sufferings, her discomforts, her hardships—when these were in the balance with the injustices meted out to women!

She would endure all, if necessary, so that women who were to come after her should have their chance to live full lives, useful and self-respecting.

And today — although her activities ended in 1906, at her death—her work lives on. Lives like hers are immortal.

Today women in America are not only voting but are actually holding offices, helping efficiently in the running of the government.

And the best of it, most American men are gracious and fair-minded and are aiding women in their work; wanting women's help, appreciating it; are giving women their dues ungrudgingly.

Today we smile at the uncivilized procedure which once thrust a woman into jail because she participated in an election. Today thinking people, both men and women, feel that for women voting is not only a privilege but a duty.

I believe that one of the important things that the Parent-Teacher Associations can do is to see that women receive recognition in school curricula, and that in no subject involving the interests of both men and women shall textbooks ignore the woman's side.

Let us place Susan B. Anthony where she belongs in American history, beside our two great men born in February, George Washington and Abraham Lincoln. Let us pay her this debt of gratitude.

Let us do this not so much for her glory but to show to our children that virtue and courage and high ideals are honored in this country whether they belong to men or women!

News from the Field

Stanton Mementos Donated to Smithsonian

TWO mementos of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, the pioneer suffragist, have just been placed on permanent exhibition in the Historical Building of the Smithsonian Institution in Washington. This gift to the nation was made by Harriet Stanton Blatch and consists of two silver pieces presented to Mrs. Stanton on the occasion of the celebration of her eightieth birthday under the auspices of the National Council of Women at a meeting held in the Metropolitan Opera House, New York, November 12, 1895.

One of these souvenirs is a large, strikingly designed loving cup, presented by the Woman Suffrage League, in recognition of the fact that Mrs. Stanton founded the National Woman Suffrage Association in 1869, and was its president and leader of the movement for a quarter of a century. The other souvenir, a silver dish carrying the quaint words, "From the Ladies of Seneca Falls," commemorates the event of the calling of the first convention of women in the history of the world by their fellow town's woman, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, at Seneca Falls, July 19 and 20, 1848.

Poets' Council Meeting

By Myrtle R. Patterson, Chairman

THE Poets' Council held its regular monthly meeting on the evening of February 20 at Woman's Party Headquarters in Washington, when a large audience enjoyed its program of poetry and music.

The guest poet, Mr. Maurice Jarvis, dramatic artist and actor and member of the Arts Club, in his dramatic readings from the classical and contemporary poets, brought into being the melodies of the poetry world, its beauty and delicate harmonies, enriched with the charm and philosophy of its true meaning. Mr. Francis Jean Reuter, poet and philosopher, gave an interesting and effective talk on "Art and Science."

A most unusual and delightful musical program was given by Mme. Regina Vicarino, operatic prima donna of international fame and Director of Music at Arlington Hall School, whose lovely voice and charming personality carried one beyond the dreams of this world; the Arlington Hall Glee Club, a group of charming young girls, and Miss Josephine Cole, violinist, accompanied by Miss Margaret Brandon, students of Arlington Hall.

Princess Nour Hamada Bey of Beirut, Syria, Founder and President of the General Oriental Woman's Alliance, was called upon for a special greeting, and read a poem in Arabic. Miss Anita Pollitzer, Vice-Chairman of the Woman's Party, closed the meeting with an effective and artistic talk on the purposes and principles of our Party.

Lost in the imagery of poetry and music before the glow of the fire-lit drawing-room of Alva Belmont House, where dreams of yesterday unite with those of today, one's thoughts turned backward a few days to the 114th birthday anniversary of Susan B. Anthony, when our nation paid tribute to our greatest woman of history, whose noble deeds are like "living poems through the ages." Is it too soon to hope for the realization of her ideals to which she devoted her life that our nation might evolve to its present-day supremacy? Let the inspiration of our poets be the inward flame lighting the pathway to the pinnacle of life's real destiny—"Equal Rights in All Human Relations"— that the dreams of our beloved Emancipator may become a reality; not tomorrow, but today, and the right to life, liberty and happiness may be woman's legal inheritance now and forever!

"Unmoral, Unsocial, Un-American"

"THE right of an individual to work —the right to give service and thereby to obtain an honorable and economically independent life—is a right which goes along with freedom, an inherent right which we obtain by being a part of society, and there should not be anything attached to the marital status or to sex affecting this right," E. Claude Babcock, president of the American Federation of Government Employees, told the Government Workers' Council in an address on the "Married Persons Law" at a meeting of the Council, Thursday evening, March 15.

Mr. Babcock said that this law (Section 213 of the 1932 Economy Act), as well as other recent orders with respect to employment, emphasizes the fact that there has grown up in the last two or three years a sort of social service attitude toward employment—a theory that an individual's right to work should be defined by the number of dependents he or she may have—a tendency to make the privilege of working or creating dependent solely on a social dependency obligation, and that there is an attempt to develop a theory of complete collapse of the relationship between work and earning and to substitute a relationship between work and social necessity. He pointed out that any personal policy adopted by the Federal Government is likely to be followed by industry. Although this law is a part of an Economy Act, he said that in its application we get the opposite result; that discharging an experienced worker and putting someone else in the place results in waste—not economy.

"This law sets up a false removal system because it makes the cause of removal the marital status, which was not a cause of removal when you took the job or when you were married," Mr. Babcock explained. "To all intents and purposes it is an ex-post-facto law; it inserts something else than ability to work into the employment system."

He pointed out that this, as well as other economy legislation, was enacted without opportunity for public hearings, and said that in order to obtain the reinstatement of a responsible personnel system for the government there must be a return to the system under which public hearings are granted before proposed bills are brought up in Congress for action. He advised the Council group to urge members of the Civil Service Committees of the House and Senate to meet and give an opportunity to the various Civil Service employees' groups to place real facts before Congress. "The married persons law," he declared, "is an attack not only on married women but on every single woman as well. If it is reasonable to throw women out of work, because they are married, it is reasonable to throw single people out of work if they have no dependents. It is just a matter of how far in this social service employment system we are going to go. We have reached a pretty bad place in American justice when we can't get a forum in which to get a case heard. This law is unmoral, unsocial, and un-American."

Rebekah S. Greathouse, formerly Assistant United States District Attorney, spoke on the relation between the campaign to obtain repeal of the "Married Persons Law" and the National Woman's Party's movement to make the Equal Rights Amendment a part of the Constitution. She called attention to the fact that new books on economics are charging that the employment of women has been one of the causes of the depression, and that women must work to change this attitude, just as they worked to win the vote. She said, "Nothing can deter women in their determination to remove from the statute books this law which sets an example to industry by discharging women on the basis of marital status."

The meeting was held at Alva Belmont House, national headquarters of the National Woman's Party, and was presided over by Florence Heath, first vice-chairman of the Council.

DAY PRINTING COMPANY
PUBLICATIONS AND BOOKS
600 East Lombard Street
Baltimore, Md.